

## **REMARKS**

Favorable consideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested. Currently, claims 9-12 and 17-22 are pending in the present application, including independent claim 9. Claims 13-15 have been cancelled herewith.

In the Final Office Action, claims 9-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Without commenting on the propriety of this rejection, the claims have been amended and it is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 9-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamaoka et al. (U.S. Patent Number 4,722,973) in view of Stehling et al. (U.S. Patent Number 5,382,631). As now amended, however, all of the presently pending claims require an elastomeric polyolefin having a density of about 0.865 g/cm<sup>3</sup> to about 0.889 g/cm<sup>3</sup> and a peak melting point range of about 49° C to about 85° C. Support for this amendment can be found throughout the present specification, including page 14, lines 26-30. It is respectfully submitted that the references cited, either alone or in any proper combination, fail to teach or suggest the presently pending claims.

For instance, Yamaoka et al. does not describe an elastomeric polyolefin having a density of about 0.865 g/cm<sup>3</sup> to about 0.889 g/cm<sup>3</sup>. Rather, as noted in the Final Office Action, Yamaoka et al. describes an ethylene alpha olefin copolymer rubber having a density of 0.863 g/cm<sup>3</sup> or less, such as 0.862 g/cm<sup>3</sup>. See Examples 1 and 7.

Furthermore, even if the rubber blend of Yamaoka et al. did disclose the claimed ranges, it would not have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have employed the rubber blend of Yamaoka et al. to form nonwoven fabrics in view of Stehling et al.

Stehling et al. describes that "in contrast to rubber blends" the "crystalline materials" described therein have "superior properties." Col. 2, line 59 – Col. 3, line 2. It was stated that the interpolymer blend components of Stehling et al. are "crystalline materials having high ethylene concentrations where the comonomer is randomly distributed along the polymer backbone chain." Id. In this manner, the random (non-tapered) molecules having high ethylene concentrations, and the blends of these components, are plastics rather than rubbers. Id. By sharp contrast, the soft segments


of Yamaoka et al. are explicitly described as rubbers. It is improper to combine references where the references teach away from their combination. In re Grasselli, 713 F.2d 731, 743, 218 USPQ 769, 779 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Here, Stehling et al. teaches away from non-crystalline rubber blends. Thus, Stehling et al. teaches away from combination with the rubber blend of Yamaoka et al.

Furthermore, to the extent that Yamaoka et al. could be said to discuss the use of crystalline polyolefins, it is only if the "desired" performance "is not impaired." Col. 7, lines 32-39. In this regard, Stehling et al. indicates crystalline polyolefins with melting points well outside of the claimed range as illustrated in Tables 7A and 7B which show melting points ranging from 99° C to 129° C. Thus, even though the Final Office Action claims that Yamaoka et al. describes a rubber blend having the claimed melting point range, it is reasonable to presume that use of crystalline polyolefins such as those described in Stehling et al. would modify such range, especially considering that the crystalline polyolefins are described in Stehling et al. as having higher melting points than those claimed. It is respectfully submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have modified Stehling et al. with Yamaoka et al. in the manner suggested in the Final Office Action. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the presently pending claims patentably define over the cited references.

In summary, Applicants submit that the presently pending claims are patentably distinct over the cited references and are in complete condition for allowance. Should any issues remain after consideration of this response, however, than Examiner Cole is invited and encouraged to telephone the undersigned at her convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING, P.A.



Neil M. Batavia  
Registration No: 54,599

P.O. Box 1449  
Greenville, SC 29602  
Telephone: (864) 271-1592  
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342

January 21, 2009  
Date